



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California 90012

County Counsel
Director of Planning

At its meeting held April 26, 2005, the Board took the following action:

9

At the time and place regularly set, notice having been duly given, the following item was called up:

Combined hearing on the following zoning matters and to consider and certify that the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) for a residential component of the project within the Pacific Concourse Business Park has been reviewed and completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), State and County Guidelines and reflects the independent judgment of the County; adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program incorporated in the FSEIR, finding that the Mitigation Monitoring Program is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and adoption of the Environmental Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project consisting of approximately 5 acres located on the west side of La Cienega Blvd. at Pacific Concourse Dr., in the community of Del Aire, Del Aire Zoned District, petitioned by Trammell Crow Residential:

General Plan Amendment Case No. 03-139-(2), an amendment to the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan land use designation from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential on the 5 acre site

Zone Change Case No. 03-139-(2), from MPD to RPD-88U

(Continued on Page 2)

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 03-139-(2), to authorize the development of a multi-family residential project consisting of a 430 unit apartment development and appurtenant structures and facilities

Variance Case No. 03-139-(2), to authorize lot coverage up to 55% of the 5-acre site to accommodate the apartment development

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 04-114-(2), to replace Conditional Use Permit Case No. 87-060-(2), which governs the Business Park, to separate the 5-acre site proposed for apartment development from a portion of the previously approved Business Park Development

Amendment to Development Agreement No. 87-060-(2), to separate the 5-acre site, proposed for apartment development, from the previously approved Business Park Development

All persons wishing to testify were sworn in by the Executive Officer of the Board. Russell Fricano, representing the Department of Regional Planning testified. Opportunity was given for interested persons to address the Board. Cindy Starrett, Lee Harrington, Michael Genthe, John Koppelman, Ardis Hahl, Jane Eriedkin and others addressed the Board. Written correspondence was presented.

Supervisor Burke made the following statement:

“The proposed LAEDC - Alexan Pacific Concourse project before the Board today will replace existing entitlements for more than 700,000 square feet of commercial uses up to 20 stories in height with a high quality, 430-unit, 4-story residential project with fewer environmental impacts than the commercial alternative. The project represents the culmination of a successful two-and-a-half-year effort to bridge multiple differences between the developer, local Del Aire residents, City of Hawthorne residents, and Business Park owners, including the County, as owner of the Airport Courthouse. Residents and other interested parties have all played an intimate role in fashioning a compromise between themselves.

(Continued on Page 3)

“During the extensive public process, which included 5 hearing sessions before the Regional Planning Commission and 2 hearing sessions before the Board, concerns were raised about converting this site for residential uses. This site was converted nearly 20 years ago from residential uses to commercial uses. There is extensive demand for high-end workforce housing in the South Bay to support the jobs growth there and there is a severe need for housing within the County. Within the South Bay, the gap between jobs and housing is growing steadily and expected to increase by another 70,000 jobs within the next 20 years.

“Within the County generally, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment says that 51,000 units were needed for 1998-2005 in the unincorporated County. The zoning capacity was analyzed as 32,157 units, and the most recent number for actual buildout was just 5,300 units. While that is probably higher now, there is still a need for tens of thousands of housing units for our growing population – who are already here, and who need housing to avoid overcrowding and long travel distances. The project will provide workforce housing for professionals and others who are likely to fill the jobs in this area, and this is an important need for the County. The state has mandated that we provide more housing to address the critical shortage, and this project will make a small but significant contribution of new housing in an area that has not seen new housing of this type in many years. Importantly, the proposed project will provide housing near employment centers, public transit and major freeways. This kind of housing is consistent with the Green Line Transit Oriented District, which this Board just approved within the last few months.

(Continued on Page 4)

“Concerns were also raised about the environmental impacts of the project, in particular traffic. However, the Environmental Impact Report indicates the recommended change from office to residential will result in fewer environmental impacts than the approved high-density commercial uses. Specifically, the proposed project would have 45% fewer daily traffic trips, 71% fewer AM peak hour trips, and 64% fewer PM peak hour trips. Project mitigation will also result in improved levels of service at several intersections, including Aviation Blvd. and Imperial Highway, La Cienega Boulevard and El Segundo, the 105 off-ramps at Imperial Highway and the 405 off-ramps at El Segundo Boulevard. In addition, the Project would be dramatically shorter and less visible from the single-family residential neighborhood than buildout of the Business Park.

“Although not related to the project, concerns were also raised about impacts to neighborhood parking created by the Courthouse. To address those concerns, 39 new parking spaces have been provided by the County along La Cienega Boulevard. In addition, the project will provide 805 parking spaces for residents and guests, consistent with Code requirements for other residential zones. The developer has also committed to work with the County to manage on-site parking for the Courthouse to further minimize potential parking overflow to the Del Aire Neighborhood, and has offered to contribute funding if necessary to address concerns.

“The County has reviewed this project in two capacities: one as approving authority in connection with the land use entitlements, the other as a neighboring landowner. County staff’s extensive efforts will ensure that the project will benefit the County and will be a good neighbor to the Del Aire neighborhood, Courthouse and other business park tenants.

“Additionally, I remain concerned over the proposed project’s close proximity just outside the 65 decibel LAX Airport Impact Area. For this reason, I propose to amend the Project to require the developer to include a noise abatement monitoring and facility upgrade program to address future impacts if the LAX Airport Impact Area is expanded further.

(Continued on Page 5)

“Based upon a thorough review of the record, input from the local residents and adjacent landowners, and the testimony offered today, it is clear that many of the concerns that were raised have been addressed, but there are still lingering concerns about the construction impacts associated with the project on adjacent Business Park landowners and the nearby Del Aire neighborhood.

“To mitigate the impact of construction on surrounding Business Park owners, I am directing that the developer to continue to work with the Business Park owners to develop reasonable and feasible construction mitigation measures, and that the project be amended to:

- Require that a construction mitigation plan be prepared and submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits;
- Limit the use of Pacific Concourse Drive by construction vehicles between certain business hours approved by the County;
- Limit the use of the Courthouse driveway by construction vehicles during certain business hours approved by the County;
- Ensure that emergency access is maintained at all times;
- Provide flagmen, as needed, to direct traffic along Pacific Concourse Drive, La Cienega, and the Courthouse driveway during construction;
- Require the developer to notify all Business Park owners prior to any disruptions in utility services associated with construction; and
- Require that the construction mitigation plan be incorporated into a private agreement to be approved and enforceable by the Business Park owners.

(Continued on Page 6)

“The proposed project requires a number of subsequent approvals from the County in its capacity as adjacent landowner, including a sewer vacation and set-aside to realign an existing sewer and execution of CC&R’s (Convenient, Conditions and Restrictions). To address concerns about the timing of these approvals and to allow the required documentation to be prepared, I propose amending the project to:

- Require that the necessary easements, licenses, sewer-related documents, bond-related documents and amendment to the CC&Rs be executed prior to issuance of a grading permit to the developer.

“In addition, there are concerns about the continuing applicability of a child care condition and employee gymnasium requirement imposed on the Business Park in 1987. The original requirements to provide a 600 square foot gymnasium within the Business Park and a 2,500 square foot child care center as part of the final phase were based on full buildout of 1,500,000 square feet of commercial uses. The proposal before us is to reduce the size of the Business Park by nearly 50%, thus the need for these facilities is reduced.

“Additionally, since the original day care center requirement was imposed, a 4,400 square foot day care center has been built within ¼ mile of the Business Park. That day care center meets the specifications of the original condition, has enrollment capacity, and therefore fills the need identified by the County in 1987 for a 2,500 square foot day care center within ½ mile of the Business Park. Furthermore, the County CAO Service Integration Branch, Office of Child Care, has identified 74 licensed child care centers and family child care homes within a three mile radius of the Business Park, as well as the new Hawthorne Center, which will serve approximately 100 children.

“The employee gymnasium requirement was a condition that benefited only the Business Park, not the public. All of the Business Park owners agree that the condition should be removed.

(Continued on Page 7)

“Against the backdrop of these circumstances, the applicant will still be required to contribute up to \$116,500 towards day care center equipment and programs at two local day care facilities.

“For these reasons, I propose amending the project to:

- Delete the day care condition in the Business Park CUP, which requires that a day care center be provided on site or within ½ mile of the Business Park.
- Amend the Business Park CUP to delete the requirement to provide a 600 square foot gymnasium.

“The developer has also agreed to contribute up to \$10,000 to help address impacts related to neighborhood parking concerns. Therefore, I propose amending the project as follows to:

- Amend Condition 23 in CUP 03-139 -(2) to provide for a contribution of up to \$10,000 to work with the County and other Business Park owners to address neighborhood parking concerns.

“There also are concerns about the clarity and specificity of a series of Public Works conditions. Additional condition modifications are required to further clarify these issues. Therefore, I direct Regional Planning Department staff to work with the developer and to amend the project as follows to:

- Amend Condition 22.m in CUP 03 -139-(2) to clarify that all items are to be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Work.

“In addition, I am concerned that the CUP’s are automatically void if any one provision is determined to be invalid. Given the level of detail included in these conditions, the permit should not become automatically void if any one condition is held or declared invalid.

(Continued on Page 8)

“Therefore, I propose amending the project to:

- Retain the County’s discretion rather than having an automatic consequence of voiding the permits in the event a condition is determined to be invalid.

“Finally, Business Park owners have raised concerns about retaining the right to have two monument signs on the corner of Pacific Concourse Drive and La Cienega. To address these concerns, the proposed zone change from MPD to RPD should be amended to allow both existing monument signs to remain in the MPD zone. Therefore, I propose amending the project to:

- Require that a revised map depicting the zone change be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning to keep both existing monument signs in the MPD zone.”

Therefore, on motion of Supervisor Burke, seconded by Supervisor Yaroslavsky, unanimously carried (Supervisor Knabe being absent), the Board closed the hearing and took the following actions:

1. Indicated that the Board has read and considered the environmental documentation for the project; and indicated its intent to certify the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report;
2. Indicated its intent to approve General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Conditional Use Permit and Variance Case Nos. 03-139-(2); and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 04-114-(2) and Amendment to Development Agreement No. 87-060-(2); with the following amendments:
 - Require that a construction mitigation plan be prepared and submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits;
 - Limit the use of Pacific Concourse Drive by construction vehicles between certain business hours approved by the County;
 - Limit the use of the Courthouse driveway by construction vehicles during certain business hours approved by the County;

(Continued on Page 9)

9 (Continued)

- Ensure that emergency access is maintained at all times;
- Provide flagmen, as needed, to direct traffic along Pacific Concourse Drive, La Cienega, and the Courthouse driveway during construction;
- Require the developer to notify all Business Park owners prior to any disruptions in utility services associated with construction;
- Require that the construction mitigation plan be incorporated into a private agreement to be approved and enforceable by the Business Park owners;
- Require that the necessary easements, licenses, sewer-related documents, bond-related documents and amendment to the CC&Rs be executed prior to issuance of a grading permit to the developer;
- Delete the day care condition in the Business Park CUP, which requires that a day care center be provided on site or within ½ mile of the Business Park;
- Amend the Business Park CUP to delete the requirement to provide a 600 square foot gymnasium;
- Amend Condition 23 in CUP 03-139 -(2) to provide for a contribution of up to \$10,000 to work with the County and other Business Park owners to address neighborhood parking concerns;
- Amend Condition 22.m in CUP 03 -139-(2) to clarify that all items are to be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works;
- Retain the County's discretion rather than having an automatic consequence of voiding the permits in the event a condition is determined to be invalid;

(Continued on Page 10)

9 (Continued)

- Require that a revised map depicting the zone change be submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning to keep both existing monument signs in the MPD zone”; and
- 3. Instructed County Counsel to prepare the necessary resolution, ordinance, findings and conditions, revisions to the development agreement, final environmental documentation as recommended by Supervisor Burke, for final approval.

04042605_9

Copies distributed

Each Supervisor
Acting Director of Public Works
Trammell Crow Residential
Cindy Starrett
Lee Harrington
Michael Genthe
John Koppelman
Ardis Hahl
Jane Eriedkin